

to pulverize Iraq in a 30-day war and then roll over it in a 100 hour ground war.

The Iraqis threatened to mine the seas. The U.S. merchant mariners sailed into the theater at best speed.

The Iraqis threatened to use chemical weapons. What did the U.S. mariners do? They ignored the threats and delivered their cargoes anyhow.

And when the war was concluded victoriously—and we had lots and lots of stuff left over there—and by the way, lots of it was ammunition—U.S. merchant mariners brought the equipment and supplies home.

Of the citizen mariners who crew Jones Act Vessels, some 8,000 are qualified to crew the government's fleet of Ready Reserve Force—or RRF—vessels in time of national need. These 90-plus RRF vessels—designed or modified to carry the outsized and heavy equipment and cargoes that characterize our military force—are core elements of our nation's strategic sealift capabilities.

More recently mariners who work domestic vessels—and in the case of our mission in Haiti, the vessels themselves—have played significant roles. When we activated Ready Reserve Force ships to support Operation JOINT ENDEAVOR in Bosnia, fully 70% of the crews that answered the call had been employed in our domestic fleet—Jones Act vessels—during the five years between the Gulf conflict and operations in Bosnia.

Next, the Jones Act is important to the United States military because it supports a U.S. shipbuilding capability that has turned a corner in recent years, with tonnage under construction increasing to the level that elevates this country from 22nd in the world to 8th.

And the act supports a maritime repair and maintenance capability that might be critical if we were to find ourselves in a protracted conflict and be obliged—as we have been in the past—to repair damaged or worn sealift assets.

Some folks have called the Jones Act a legislative life-support system for an aging, dying creature. I would like to note that over the past three decades:

America's domestic fleet—vessels exceeding 1,000 tons gross weight tonnage—doubled in numbers from 1965 to 95

... it tripled productivity during that same period, and

... reached the one billion ton cargo threshold for the first time in 1995.

Now I guess I've got to ask you—and myself at the same time—do we hear any death rattles in those statistics. I certainly don't hear any.

And Jones Act vessels are part of our newest initiative—VISA—the Voluntary Intermodal Sealift Agreement, implemented only this year following its development with MARAD.

Many of you here are members of organizations which are participating in the groundbreaking initiative... and we want to thank you for your support.

VISA is very similar to the highly successful Civil Reserve Air Fleet—or CRAF—that has served our nation's military airlift needs so well.

VISA—like the Jones Act—is another win-win construct, DOD gains capacity—access actually to capacity—intermodal capacity—vice specific hulls. Contracts are being pre-negotiated: we will know what we will have to pay; carriers will know what they will get.

And this is a very important point, we are planning jointly with our industry partners. And I might add on the side, that this planning has received national recognition and the people that have been part of this planning group for the last two years, have been recent recipients of the hammer award. This

joint planning means industry representatives—that have security clearances—sit with us as we develop war plans. Now that's unprecedented. And their inputs and suggestions are proving extraordinarily valuable to us. So we are very excited about that.

Industry is learning ahead of time what we will need, which in turn enables them to project accurately and protect their market share. We are not just getting access to specific ships, as I mentioned a minute ago, we are getting access to worldwide intermodal system capacity and expertise. And as you know, by watching what has been going on in the intermodal world, this has become much more important than even in the past.

I know of few military people—and virtually none who have experienced it—who would seek the opportunity for military confrontation or combat. But as you know, the odds and history don't offer much hope that total peace will break out anytime soon or for long.

Air lift is swift—to be sure. It can move personnel and high priority cargo around the world in only hours. Along with long-range air strikes. It gives us awesome halting power to stop an aggressor's advance. But to mount and sustain a counter attack and drive to victory—as far as we can see into the future—still will require strategic sealift.

Sealift will move the bulk of the unit equipment—what are we talking about?—the tanks, artillery and trucks—that will ultimately uproot an aggressor and defeat him. And it will deliver the sustaining supplies to carry the day. Fully 90 to 95% of all war materials and supplies will be delivered by sealift.

So for the reasons cited—the Jones Act is an important element supporting that requirement. It provides a very important root system that sustains our sealift capability.

In conclusion, the Jones Act is a proven performer that supports both our nation's military security and its economic soundness.

I'd like to thank you for inviting me here today. And I certainly wish you all the best of success with this session that you are having here, but more importantly I wish you continued success in your fields so we can continue making our great nation even greater and even stronger.

#### FAST TRACK AUTHORITY

#### HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2621, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act of 1997, which would provide fast-track authority to the President. While I believe free trade is important, I do not believe Congress should just turn over our constitutional authority on trade to the President whenever he asks. The current version of H.R. 2621 is more restrictive than the past legislation which enabled Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton to negotiate GATT and NAFTA.

Congress must ensure that labor and environmental standards can be raised in the context of trade issues. With increased globalization, these issues are becoming interrelated. Unfortunately, there has been a trend within the executive branch of the United States to delink trade policy with other important foreign policy goals like promotion of fair

labor standards, elimination of child labor, improvement in environmental conditions, and the promotion of human rights.

Trade policy has in some cases become the No. 1 priority, with other important issues being put on the back burner and receiving less attention. One such example was the United States willingness to impose trade sanctions against the Chinese for their violation of international standards on intellectual property rights. However, the administration was unwilling to impose sanctions because of restrictions on religious freedom in China which also violated international law. This is not consistent policy.

Mr. Speaker, I review trade agreements on a case by case basis and how they will affect jobs in my district. I supported the Uruguay round of the GATT because I thought it was a good deal for the United States. I opposed NAFTA because I did not think it was the best deal we could have gotten. I argued then that we needed to have high standards for NAFTA because it would be expanded to include Latin and South America. If we pass this version of fast track, the administration could easily expand some of the flawed provisions of NAFTA.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would vote for the President to have expedited trade negotiating authority only if it includes authority to improve labor, environmental, and human rights standards. If fast track fails, the administration still has authority to negotiate trade agreements. The United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement was negotiated without fast track and the Uruguay round of the GATT proceeded for several years without fast track. The United States must take its time to negotiate good trade agreements which will benefit our businesses, our workers, and represent our values.

#### COMMENDING KEN ENNS OF ENNS PACKING

#### HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Ken Enns and his company, Enns Packing, who have made major contributions to the underprivileged people of California.

Ken has a strong history of support for California Emergency Foodlink which is a non-profit organization that provides food to the hungry throughout California. In 1992, his company was a major donor to Foodlink's Donate-Don't Dump program. Donate-Don't Dump assists the U.S. Department of Agriculture's community program by providing private food donations. Enns Packing offered added support to this program in 1997 when it donated close to 3 million pounds of fresh fruit.

Ken and Enns Packing give fresh produce to help feed 1.5 million needy Californians each month during the summer. Ken has also been instrumental in encouraging companies similar to his to support Foodlink. His efforts resulted in Foodlink's distribution of over 32 million pounds of donated food in 1996.

Ken's philanthropy has contributed greatly to help feed the hungry people of California. I congratulate Ken and Enns Packing on their

efforts, as they exemplify the impact the private sector can have on our communities.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has begun the process of localizing, privatizing, and eliminating outmoded and counterproductive Federal programs. But that isn't enough. The American people—through their families, religious and civic organizations and through their workplace—must make a commitment to be personally responsible for solving the challenges that face us. Ken Enns and Enns Packing have done just that. Ken and Enns Packing serve as a model for each of us. I urge every American to study how Ken has contributed to his community. Most importantly, I urge every American to put into practice in their own lives the lesson that Ken can teach us.

ATTORNEY GENERAL AWARD TO  
STEPHANIE BOUCHER

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, November 13, 1997*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer recognition to an individual who recently received an extraordinary honor for her contributions at the workplace. Stephanie Boucher, the wife of one of my legislative assistants, received an Appreciation Award from the Attorney General on September 26, 1997.

What is unusual about this event was the fact that Stephanie is not a Federal employee. She is a contract worker employed at the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys [EOUSA] in the Department of Justice. I have been informed that it is highly unusual for contract employees to receive any type of official recognition from the Government for their work. Yet, over the past 15 months, Stephanie has shown that she is not the typical contract employee.

Stephanie received this award for "motivating and stimulating EOUSA's Freedom of Information Act/Privacy Act [FOIA] staff with her team spirit, productive work ethics, and willingness to go the extra mile to reach the Attorney General's goal of reducing the FOIA backlog." This backlog, which resulted from Congress' reform and expansion of the FOIA legislation, at one point reached nearly 1,000 requests pending. It was through the hard work, willingness to work extra hours, and dedication to detail shown by Stephanie and three other contract employees, under the direction of Acting Director Bonnie Gay, that the backlog was reduced to zero by the end of fiscal year 1997. I would further note that despite the extraordinary circumstances of receiving recognition for their accomplishments from the Attorney General, none of them received any acknowledgement or congratulations from the contract employer.

What sets Stephanie apart in my mind from her colleagues is the fact that she accomplished all this while attending law school full time in the evenings at the University of Baltimore. I know from personal experience how difficult and demanding law school is, and believe that this underscores this young woman's strong work ethic.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would note that the administration requested funding in the fiscal year 1998 budget for eight additional positions in the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys to

handle FOIA requests. Furthermore, it is my understanding that two of Stephanie's colleagues have been brought on full time with the Government since the issuance of this award. It is my opinion that Stephanie has already shown, through her past performance, that she would make a fine addition to the expanded EOUSA FOIA staff.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT  
AUTHORITIES ACT

**HON. THOMAS J. MANTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, November 13, 1997*

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2621, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act. The debate over fast track is not a debate over whether the United States should engage in world trade. Clearly, we should. This debate is about whether our Government will finally adopt trade rules that will put the interests of working families first instead of the rights of corporations to make huge profits at their expense.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that trade agreements must not be considered in isolation of the consequences which might befall workers and the environment. Unfortunately, the bill before us does not require that future trade agreements ensure progress toward ensuring workers' rights and enhancing environmental protections. Instead, the bill limits the labor and environmental issues which can be considered under fast track authority to those that are "directly related to trade and decrease market opportunities for U.S. exports or distort U.S. trade." This wording attempts to hide the continued disregard for American workers behind carefully constructed language that allows trade negotiators to pay lip-service to environmental, consumer, and labor issues without requiring them to do anything about them. Instead, labor and environmental issues will be ignored or relegated to NAFTA-like side agreements which have proven to be wholly inadequate and have made implementation of these provisions virtually unenforceable in the past.

In addition, this fast track legislation grants the President wider authority over trade than given to any previous administration since its inception. And, while lawmakers could vote either up or down on a specific proposal, they would be stripped of their powers to amend, revise, correct, or improve complex, and far-reaching trade agreements, effectively denying Congress its constitutional right to regulate foreign commerce.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has promised that if granted fast track authority, they will use it to expand NAFTA to Chile as the first step toward creation of a Free Trade Zone of the Americas. But, after 3 years of the NAFTA experience, the evidence shows that as both a trade agreement and a trade model, NAFTA has been a failure. We have seen a trade surplus with Mexico transformed into a \$16 billion deficit, part of a total United States trade deficit with Canada and Mexico of \$48.3 billion dollars. We have seen a net loss of U.S. jobs in all 50 States totaling more than 420,000, including 20,000 in my home State of New York alone.

And, recently Mr. Speaker, the negative effects of NAFTA have struck my own Seventh

Congressional District of New York particularly hard. Swingline, a manufacturer of staples and staple products located in Long Island City, recently announced plans to close down their plant and move their operations to Mexico. The Swingline plant has operated in New York for the last 75 years, including the last 40 in Long Island City. Swingline has long been a fixture in the Long Island City community, employing more than 400 workers, a majority of whom have only known that job their entire lives.

In addition, we have seen increased Mexican imports, coupled with restrictive inspection requirements and inadequate funding, combining to overwhelm border inspection systems. This has resulted in an increased volume of tainted foods coming into the United States, most recently demonstrated with the outbreak of 130 cases of Hepatitis-A in Michigan which were traced to strawberries illegally imported from Mexico. We have also seen an increase in unsafe Mexican carrier traffic traveling over United States highways, as NAFTA has provided for neither the financial support nor regulatory incentives to bring Mexican standards up to United States levels. And, Mr. Speaker, we have seen an increase in the flow of illegal drugs from Mexico as NAFTA's new flood of truckloads of imports has provided the means by which these illegal contraband may enter the United States undetected. Recent State Department estimates show that now 70 percent of cocaine, 80 percent of marijuana, and 30 percent of heroin enter the United States through Mexico, up significantly from pre-NAFTA levels.

Mr. Speaker, fast track supporters would have you believe that without this authority, the United States will be shut out from entering into lucrative trade deals in South America. But this is just not true. Indeed, in recent years trade between the United States and South America has moved from a deficit to a healthy surplus, even though we do not have any NAFTA-type free trade agreements with these countries. And, a lack of fast track authority has also not prevented the current administration from having negotiated more than 200 trade agreements with other countries since 1993.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, the debate before us is not whether America trades with the world, but what are the rules under which that trade takes place. Workers rights, environmental protections, and food safety must have a place on the negotiating agenda for any trade agreement. Unfortunately, this legislation before us does not adequately provide for their consideration. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this fast track legislation and to give all future trade agreements and our overall trade policy the careful scrutiny they require and deserve.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT  
AUTHORITIES ACT

**HON. JAY KIM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, November 13, 1997*

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2621, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act, a bill to renew the President's authority to negotiate international trade